DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 592 EA 023 127

TITLE Evaluation Report of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2, 1988-89. Report prepared for the Governor's Advisory Committee on ECIA, Chapter 2.

INSTITUTION California State Dept. of Education, Sacramento. Office of Program Evaluation and Research.

PUB DATE 90

NOTE 37p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.

DESCRIPTORS *Block Grants; Elementary Secondary Education; *Expenditures; *Federal Aid; Program Evaluation; Resource Allocation; School Funds; *State Programs

IDENTIFIERS *California; *Education Consolidation Improvement Act Chapter 2

ABSTRACT

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981 consolidated 29 federally funded categorical programs into an education block grant available to all state education agencies and, through them, to school districts. Chapter 2's legislative purpose was to transfer authority and responsibility to state and local education agencies. This report summarizes evaluation findings for activities conducted with Chapter 2 state-purposes funds for 1988-89. The introduction is followed by a description of the allocation and use of state-purposes funds and a discussion of the evaluation of six selected state-purposes activities, which include programs for parent involvement and high-risk youth, the Constitutional Rights Foundation, Federal Teacher Centers, the History Project of California, and Superintendents Academy. Strengths of the funded services include the development of course and curriculum models, training programs, a statewide parent involvement initiative, hands-on teacher and student activities, and local in-kind support. The Governor's Advisory Committee recommends that future activities include instruction of nontraditionally taught languages, a nonpublic schools program, and minority education improvement. Two tables are included. Appendices provide detailed information on expenditures and activities. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED333592

Evaluation Report of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act, Chapter 2 1988-89

Prepared for the
Governor's Advisory Committee
on ECIA, Chapter 2
by the
Program Evaluation and
Research Division

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T. Smith

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CALIFORNIA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Sacramento, 1990

EA 023 187

Publishing Information

This report was prepared by Cathy George, Consultant, and Jan Volkoff, Research Analyst, Special Studies and Evaluation Unit, Program Evaluation and Research Division, California Department of Education. The report, which was prepared under the direction of Claire Quinlan, Administrator, Special Studies and Evaluation Reports Unit, was published by the Department, 721 Capitol Mall, Sacramento, California (mailing address: P.O. Box 944272, Sacramento, CA 94244-2720). Any questions regarding this report should be addressed to the Special Studies and Evaluation Unit, Program Evaluation and Research Division; telephone (916) 322-5012. This report was distributed under the provisions of the Library Distribution Act and *Government Code* Section 11096.

1990

CONTENTS

I. INTRODUCTION..... 1

II. ALLOCATION AND USE OF STATE-PURPOSES FUNDS..... 2

III. EVALUATION OF SELECTED STATE-PURPOSES ACTIVITIES..... 5

Parent Involvement..... 6

High Risk Youth..... 7

Constitutional Rights Foundation..... 10

Federal Teacher Centers..... 15

History Project of California..... 18

Superintendents Academy..... 20

IV. HIGHLIGHTS..... 21

V. COMMENTS OF THE GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHAPTER 2..... 23

APPENDICES

A. Expenditure Detail of Selected Chapter 2 State-Purposes Activities..... 24

B. Information Regarding Local ECIA, Chapter 2, Expenditures and Activities..... 29

TABLES

1. ECIA, CHAPTER 2, EXPENDITURES, 1988-89..... 3

2. PROGRAM INFORMATION, California Federal Teacher Centers, 1988-89..... 16

I. INTRODUCTION

Chapter 2 of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act (ECIA) of 1981 consolidated 29 federally funded categorical programs into an education block grant to all state educational agencies and, through them, to all school districts. Section 561(b) of Chapter 2 declared that the legislative purpose of Chapter 2 was to be the transfer of authority and responsibility to state and local educational agencies. The block grant became effective for the 1982-83 state fiscal year. Congress intended the program to be implemented with a minimum of paperwork and designated each state educational agency as the agency responsible for the administration and supervision of programs assisted under the law.

Congress also required each state to have an advisory committee representative of children in public and private schools, classroom teachers, parents, local boards of education, local and regional school administrators, institutions of higher education, and the state Legislature. The function of the Chapter 2 advisory committee is "to advise the state education agency on the allocation among authorized functions of funds (not to exceed 20 percentum of the amount of the state's allotment) reserved for state use under section 565(a), on the formula for the allocation of funds to local educational agencies, and on the planning, development, support, implementation, and evaluation of state programs assisted under this chapter" (ECIA of 1981 [PL 97-35], Title V, Subtitle D, Chapter 2, Section 564[a][2][G]).

This report summarizes the evaluation findings for activities conducted with Chapter 2 state-purposes funds for the fiscal year beginning in July, 1988, and including the 1988-89 school year. The report is divided into five sections: (1) an introduction; (2) a description of the allocation and use of state-purposes funds; (3) a discussion of the evaluation of six selected state-purposes activities; (4) conclusions; and (5) comments of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Chapter 2. The six state-purposes activities evaluated are Parent Involvement, High Risk Youth, Constitutional Rights Foundation, Federal Teacher Centers, History Project of California, and Superintendents Academy. Appendix A contains a detailed description of the expenditures for each of the six state-purposes activities evaluated in this report. Appendix B contains information regarding local ECIA, Chapter 2, expenditures and activities.

In 1988, Public Law 100-297 (Hawkins-Stafford bill) was passed reauthorizing and revising the Chapter 2 block grant program for the 1989-90 fiscal year. Final regulations were effective June, 1990, making this evaluation report the final report under the old regulations.

II. ALLOCATION AND USE OF STATE-PURPOSES FUNDS

State-purposes funds can be expended for activities previously authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (P.L. 89-10), Title V-B Program (Strengthening State Educational Agency Management). These activities include but are not limited to the following:

1. Providing local educational agencies with technical assistance to improve instructional programs, including ways for parents to assist their children
2. Providing local educational agencies with technical assistance to improve planning, program management, citizen involvement, and staff development
3. Conducting workshops/conferences to facilitate communication among educators and between educators and the public
4. Developing curriculum materials and programs
5. Developing statewide student assessment programs
6. Disseminating information regarding effective educational practices
7. Enhancing other governmental branches' analyses of state educational issues
8. Coordinating public school programs with those in private schools and monitoring federal requirements for program participation of private school students
9. Providing professional development for state educational agency employees

Two other allowable activities that are frequently conducted by state departments of education, according to an analysis by the U.S. Department of Education's Office of Planning, Budget, and Evaluation (Summary of State Evaluations of the ECIA Chapter 2 Program, Program Year 1983-84), are the strengthening of the state educational agencies' internal resources and administration of the Chapter 2 program.

The total Chapter 2 expenditures for 1988-89 were $47,729,042. Itemized expenditures are shown in Table 1. Eighty percent of the grant award, $38,296,408, was allocated to local assistance. A total of $9,432,634 was expended for state purposes, representing 20 percent of the grant award.

Of the state-purposes funds, most are committed to the ongoing support of existing State Department of Education programs and services. These state-operations programs expended $8,026,524 during 1988-89. Also for 1988-89, the Legislative priority projects, Constitutional Rights Foundation and Federal Teacher Centers, had total expenditures of $594,910. The remaining $811,200 was allocated for the Superintendent's priority projects. These are short-term projects designed to meet critical needs in curriculum, instruction, or assessment.

Table 1

ECIA, CHAPTER 2, EXPENDITURES, 1988-89

I.	Formula Allocation to LEAs		$38,296,408
II.	State Purposes		
	A. SDE Operations		
	1. Committee and State Board	99,980	
	2. Instructional Support Services	2,494,958	
	3. Curriculum Instruction and Assessment	2,302,542	
	4. Special Support Programs	1,489,802	
	5. Accountability and Evaluation	1,499,261	
	6. Compliance Monitoring	139,981	
	Subtotal, SDE Operations		8,026,524
	B. Legislature's Priority Projects		
	1. Constitutional Rights Foundation	300,000	
	2. Teacher Centers	294,910	
	Subtotal, Legislature's Priority Projects		594,910
	C. Superintendent's Priority Projects		
	1. School Improvement	140,000	
	2. Visual and Performing Arts Training Program K-12	60,000	
	3. Statewide Services - Nonpublic Schools	140,000	
	4. California Literature Project	100,000	
	5. California Reading Initiative	50,000	
	6. History Project of California	100,000	
	7. Promoting the Teaching of Uncommonly Taught Languages	25,000	
	8. College Prep of Underrepresented Minority Students	21,200	
	9. Collaborative Getty Institute for Educators on the Visual Arts	75,000	
	10. Upper Elementary Grades Task Force	20,000	
	11. Improving Coordination Between Higher Education and K-12	30,000	
	12. Superintendents Academy	50,000	
	Subtotal, Superintendent's Priority Projects		811,200
TOTAL, 1988-89 CHAPTER 2 EXPENDITURES			**$47,729,042**

Services for nonpublic schools are required by federal law. Chapter 2 state-purposes funds are used to support a nonpublic schools unit, and an additional $140,000 was included in the Superintendent's priority projects for services to nonpublic schools. California Department of Education staff consult with the California Private School Advisory Committee to determine the needs of private schools each year. In 1988-89, 30 minigrants were funded to provide in-service training on curriculum development. Training was provided for approximately 1,200 private school educators. A second major activity involved the provision of four one-day workshops to train over 200 private school educators to integrate the Private School Guidelines for Substance Abuse Prevention into their schools' curriculum.

III. EVALUATION OF SELECTED STATE-PURPOSES ACTIVITIES

The Governor's Advisory Committee on Chapter 2 has played a prominent role in overseeing expenditures of the state-purposes portion of Chapter 2 since the inception of the law. The committee has urged the California Department of Education to use the funds for development of products and services that will have relatively high visibility and high likelihood of achieving discernible impact on school staff and students. State-purposes monies are used primarily for developmental efforts which would be beyond the capability of most local districts to conduct. Through the development of products, such as curriculum guides and frameworks and parent involvement materials, economies of scale are achieved. Through this targeted use of Chapter 2 funds for developmental efforts, products and services which would be beyond the capability of most districts to produce or purchase, even if increased funding were made available, are provided to all school districts in the state.

Because Chapter 2 monies are used to fund a wide variety of programs, it is not feasible to provide yearly evaluation on all Chapter 2-funded projects. The evaluation approach the advisory committee has taken has been to request an accounting of activities and accomplishments of selected projects each year. For 1988-89, the Governor's Advisory Committee on Chapter 2, through its evaluation subcommittee, requested that information be provided regarding the Chapter 2-funded, state-purposes activities of six projects. Two of the evaluated projects are state operations projects: Parent Involvement and High Risk Youth. The two legislative priority projects, Constitutional Rights Foundation and Federal Teacher Centers, were examined. In addition, two of the Superintendent's priority projects were also evaluated: History Project of California and Superintendents Academy. The staff of these projects provided information for this evaluation report based upon their 1988-89 goals and objectives which were funded by Chapter 2. The Parent Involvement and High Risk Youth projects are state-purposes units located within the Department of Education. The Federal Teacher Centers and Constitutional Rights Foundation are on-going projects administered outside of the Department of Education and coordinated by Department staff. The Constitutional Teachers Institute and Superintendents Academy are Superintendent's priority projects administered by Department staff. The appendix contains a detailed description of the budget expenditures and a summary of activities for each of the six areas evaluated.

In addition to information provided through the formal evaluation report, the committee receives frequent oral briefings from California Department of Education staff members on the activities and programs in the Department that are being funded, in whole or in part, by Chapter 2 state-purposes funds. The oral briefings keep the committee informed regarding the progress of key developmental efforts of the Department.

Parent Involvement

The mission of the Parent Involvement unit is to implement statewide strategies emphasizing effective methods that parents can employ at home to facilitate their children's academic success. During 1988-89 approximately $166,000 in Chapter 2 funds were used to support this program. This amount funded 2.0 FTE staff which included one consultant and one clerical support staff.

A major activity of the Parent Involvement unit for 1988-89 was to facilitate and coordinate the development of a California Department of Education Parent Initiative through the Parent Involvement Steering Committee. The Steering Committee, which formed in January, 1988, is composed of six researchers nationally known for their research on parent involvement and student success and six outstanding practitioners of successful parent learning programs.

In February, 1988, the Committee's assignment was to assist in the formation of a Parent Involvement Initiative for the Department. An initiative was presented to the State Board of Education in November and was adopted by the Board in January, 1989. The initiative, which was distributed to all school district and county superintendents and all school principals, includes a State Board policy on parent involvement and the Department strategy plan to assist districts in developing and implementing comprehensive programs of parent involvement.

The Department strategy involves identifying model programs and practices; targeting funds for the development of model programs and practices; providing schools and districts with technical assistance; incorporating parent involvement criteria into the Department's program quality review process; and providing continuing follow-up and evaluation of the effects of the Department's initiative. The first document produced to assist parents, The Changing Mathematics Curriculum, A Booklet for Parents, was disseminated to all principals, county and district superintendents, district directors of state and federal programs, and special interest groups such as the Parent-Teachers Association.

In order to present the State Board's Parent Involvement Initiative and to provide education personnel and parents with strategies for its implementation, the Parent Involvement unit conducted four seminars during April, 1989. These regional one-day workshops took place throughout the state highlighting programs and strategies, which have been successful in diversified settings and which model the State Board policy. Among the presenters were members of the Parent Involvement Steering Committee, nationally known researchers Joyce Epstein from Johns Hopkins University and Reginald Clark from Claremont, California.

The seminars were planned to accommodate a total of 800 people statewide (administrators, principals, teachers, and parents). An average of 40 more than anticipated were served at each site, and approximately 300 registrations had to be returned because of limited space. The large number of registration

requests and post-seminar phone calls reflected both the need and very high interest among parents and educators for this information. Follow-up seminars were planned for January of 1990 in six locations across the state.

Another major activity of the unit undertaken during 1988-89 included the formation of an Intradepartmental Committee on Parent Involvement to provide a structure and focus to Departmental field assistance activities relating to parental involvement issues. The Committee was developed during 1988-89 and was composed of representatives from 12 Departmental units which provide parental involvement services. Three meetings were held during 1988-89. The focus of the meetings was for participants to understand the objectives of each unit relating to parent involvement and to develop a coordinated Departmental strategy for meeting the needs of districts.

During 1988-89 the Parent Involvement unit had planned to compile and disseminate--to principals, superintendents, state and federal program directors, and special interest groups--parent involvement packets, including materials and documents regarding effective parent involvement strategies. However, this activity was not completed because of lack of funds and was rescheduled for 1989-90.

High Risk Youth

The High Risk Youth unit expended approximately $377,000 of Chapter 2 funds in 1988-89 which supported 4.0 FTE staff, three education consultants, and one clerical support staff member.

Description of C-LERN. The Chapter 2-funded services of the High Risk Youth unit are delivered through the development and administration of the California Local Educational Reform Network (C-LERN), a network of schools which volunteer to take part in a common process. Built upon the premises "that all children can learn, teachers can teach, and schools are the variable," the process used by C-LERN schools is a five-year commitment by a school and district to become involved in working towards schoolwide change and improvement. While involvement in C-LERN is open to all California schools, the High Risk Youth unit continues to encourage low-performing schools and/or schools enrolling a large number of "at-risk" youth to join the network.

In 1987-88, 50 schools volunteered to begin the five-year improvement process. In 1988-89, 38 schools became the second cohort to join C-LERN. While C-LERN schools span a range from predominately black, inner-city schools to suburban schools, the majority of schools serve large minority populations. Among the high minority schools in 1987-88, the dominant minority group was black. An analysis of CAP scores for 1987-88 C-LERN schools shows that approximately 40% of the C-LERN schools were scoring in the bottom quarter of schools like them at the beginning of their involvement in C-LERN.

The process used by C-LERN schools consists of five phases over five years. Phase one, occurring during 1987-88 for the first cohort, involved a schoolwide diagnosis of each school's organizational, environmental, cultural, and programmatic deficiencies. This diagnosis was accomplished through a site interview process developed and provided by Sage Analytics International and

funded through each school and district. As part of the diagnosis, certain key deficiencies specific to each school site were prioritized, and school personnel developed intervention strategies to address these key issues. For example, a key deficiency for one high school was lack of student self-esteem. The intervention strategy prescribed by the school was to implement during the next school year an adopt-a-student program where identified students were assigned to a counselor for social as well as academic needs. The counselor would then meet with each individual student twice monthly, meet with each students' parents once monthly, and prepare monthly reports of student progress.

In phase two, which took place during 1988-89 for the first cohort, C-LERN school teams organized the key schoolwide strategies developed during the previous year into intervention plans for their respective sites and began implementation of the key schoolwide strategies. In addition, during phase two, a second diagnosis took place. Instead of the generalized schoolwide diagnosis of year one, a more specified diagnosis of each C-LERN school's curriculum deficiencies was done, producing information on key curriculum areas needing to be addressed by each school. Criteria for the in-depth curriculum diagnosis were developed by High Risk Youth staff using the California Curriculum Frameworks, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve; Model Curriculum Guides, Kindergarten Through Grade Eight; and Model Curriculum Standards, Grades Nine Through Twelve. Additionally during phase two, personnel at C-LERN schools developed intervention strategies and plans to address the key curriculum deficiencies delineated in the curriculum diagnosis.

During phase three, which was planned for 1989-90, the first cohort of C-LERN schools will continue implementation of schoolwide strategies, will begin implementation of curriculum strategies, and will be reassessed using the schoolwide diagnosis process of phase one. The goals of this phase are to determine the progress of C-LERN schools since 1987-88. Phase four, planned for 1990-91, will focus on diagnosing C-LERN schools using Department of Education School Improvement Program quality criteria. Developmental efforts by the High Risk Youth unit will take place during 1989-90 to incorporate program quality review criteria into the Sage diagnosis process for the following year. Phase five, anticipated for 1991-92, will involve maintenance, monitoring, and final evaluation of C-LERN school progress. The planning and development for this phase will be done during 1990-91.

High Risk Youth Activities. In order to assist schools and districts in identification of specific intervention strategies and development of individualized implementation plans for phase two, the High Risk Youth unit during 1988-89 sponsored and coordinated three summer institutes and four regional workshops.

Of the three summer institutes, two took place during July and August of 1988, each lasting four days each. Chapter 2 paid for institute facilities, presenter fees, and workshop materials. Travel costs for participants were paid locally. Attended by 350 participants representing 46 C-LERN schools and 15 districts, the institutes featured presenters who shared ideas and strategies that could be implemented with the opening of school in September. Presenters represented the University of California, California State University, California Community Colleges, College Board, California Department of Education, Far West

Regional Educational Laboratory, county offices of education, and school districts.

Presentation workshops covered the areas of core curriculum, instructional strategies, parent involvement, school climate, and networking. An evaluation questionnaire was used to assess each workshop session. Overall, participants rated presenters as above-average; as being knowledgeable about their subject area; and as being able to communicate subject content effectively. Subject content was rated above average (4.06 out of 5.0, 5.0 being the highest rating). Participants rated their own capabilities to use the knowledge of the institutes as 4.01 out of 5.0 and the overall worth of the institutes as 4.04. Weaknesses of the institutes included concern about the lack of attendance by all C-LERN schools and inadequate site facilities.

The third and final summer institute during 1988-89 occurred during June of 1989 and also lasted four days. Three hundred fifty participants attended representing 80 C-LERN schools. In addition, 100 participants representing approximately 15 Senate Bill 65 (SB 65) (dropout prevention and recovery programs) schools also attended the institute with funding through SB 65.

The goals of the June, 1989, institute were to assist Site Leadership Teams from C-LERN schools and representatives from schools implementing SB 65 in awareness of state-of-the-art strategies and programs; to facilitate team building, networking, and interaction among teams; to assist teams in implementation of strategies; and to link the expertise of C-LERN and SB 65 schools. In addition, the institute served to provide a forum for input from C-LERN school representatives on their progress and on their needs and concerns.

Presenters represented various educational entities and covered program areas similar to those of the 1988 institutes. An evaluation survey was also used for the June, 1989, institute. Participants rated the institute "excellent" in effectively achieving its goals and the workshops "extremely useful" in application.

Four regional workshops also took place during 1988-89 in order to assist C-LERN administrators, teachers, parents, and students in the use of specific strategies to implement their intervention plans. The one-day regional workshops were designed to provide follow-up activities to the summer institutes. More than 200 educators participated in the two southern workshops, and 150 participated in the two northern workshops. Participants rated the extent to which the workshops were successful as above average.

Also during 1988-89, the High Risk Youth unit planned for a Curriculum Academy to be held in 1989-90 in conjunction with the College Board-Equality Project. The Curriculum Academy was planned for secondary schools in phase two to develop the capacity of secondary teachers to improve their instructional skills and to train their colleagues. The training will provide an opportunity for participants to work collaboratively, to network, and to identify resources to assist in implementing curricula changes at their school site. Five planning meetings, which included College Board personnel, California State University Deans, and C-LERN personnel, took place during 1989-90 to determine the Curriculum Academy agenda, content, and logistics.

Evaluation. Because the C-LERN process is a five-year commitment by each participating school and schools beginning in 1987-88 were only in their second year of the C-LERN process, it was too early during 1988-89 for Department efforts to determine progress; however, it is expected that over the five-year commitment period, data will be provided regarding school progress.

The High Risk Youth unit has begun to collect data which will be used on a formative basis to plan technical assistance. Assessment of C-LERN school progress occurring during 1988-89 included analysis of California Basic Educational Data System and California Assessment Program data by the High Risk Youth unit. This process was expanded for 1989-90 to include monthly data collection of 16 indicators of school progress, e.g., number of disciplinary suspensions, number of dropouts, number of truancies, number of teacher absences, and number of parents attending school events. Data collection and analysis during 1988-89 will be used as baseline data for 1991-92 assessment of C-LERN schools. The High Risk Youth unit also monitored progress of C-LERN schools through weekly reports submitted from each school regarding activities which had taken place to implement the school's plans. These reports were reviewed by professional staff and follow-up and/or technical assistance provided as required.

An evaluation survey of C-LERN participants' perceptions of the success of the process used by C-LERN schools was conducted during the 1988-89 summer institutes through in-kind services of the Far West Regional Educational Laboratory. A 28-item questionnaire, developed by Far West Laboratory, was completed by 171 summer institute participants who had been involved in the C-LERN process for one year or more and represented 41 C-LERN schools. The report of the findings will be completed and available by January, 1990. Preliminary findings of the survey indicated that, in general, respondents appeared satisfied with the C-LERN process. Of the respondents, 67 percent believed that problems were accurately identified and that C-LERN had clarified their school mission; 64 percent would recommend the process to another school, and 64 percent found the information provided by the summer institute to be helpful. When asked if intervention strategies had been effective, whether or not results were permanent, and whether or not C-LERN had accomplished goals, most respondents gave a neutral response. The preliminary analysis of the data suggested that the process used by C-LERN schools may not have been implemented long enough for school staff to identify measurable differences.

Constitutional Rights Foundation

Since 1962 the Constitutional Rights Foundation (CRF) has been working with students and schools locally, statewide, and nationally to support and strengthen the preparation of young people for citizenship. It provides a wide-range of law-related, business, citizenship, and youth leadership programs and publications emphasizing challenging content and student interaction and involvement in the classroom, school, and community.

A national organization based in Los Angeles and funded by various sources, the CRF began receiving Chapter 2 funds through the California Department of Education in 1982 to administer and coordinate several school-related programs. For 1988-89, the CRF expended $300,000 in Chapter 2 funds largely for staff costs

to administer and coordinate statewide Mock Trial Competitions, History Day competitions, Law Day competitions, secondary teacher training in History/Social Science, the quarterly production of the Bill of Rights in Action, and the State Project Advisory and History Day Advisory Committees.

Mock Trial Competitions. Each year CRF staff develop a criminal court case simulation which is used by teams of high school students in a simulated trial situation held in actual courtrooms presided over by judges and scored by attorney volunteers. County offices of education organize teacher and justice system volunteer involvement and arrange for the case to be presented in a series of elimination rounds in courtrooms. County finalists compete in statewide finals in Sacramento, and a winning team is selected the state champion for the year. The state champion team then competes in the national finals.

In the Mock Trial, students portray each of the principal players in the cast of courtroom characters. As the student teams study a hypothetical case, conduct legal research, and receive guidance from volunteer attorneys in courtroom procedure and trial preparation, they acquire a working knowledge of the judicial system. Students participate as counsel, witnesses, court clerks, and bailiffs. A pretrial motion is included as part of the case and has a direct bearing on the charges in the trial itself. In the case of People v. Willow, the case developed for 1988-89, the pretrial explored the concept of clear and present danger. The arguments presented in the case confronted the issue of the balance between the right to free speech and the protection of the public welfare (in this instance, high school students and the community) through the application of the doctrine of clear and present danger. Thus, students investigated the legal application of the clear and present danger doctrine and how it specifically related to the First and Fourteenth Amendments. In both the pretrial motion and the trial itself, students present their cases in court before actual Municipal, Superior, and Appellate Court judges and attorneys. Since teams are unaware of which side of the case they will present until shortly before the competition begins, they must prepare a case for both the prosecution and defense. All teams are required to present both sides at least once during the competition.

During 1988-89, 350 schools in 22 counties were involved at both the county level and state competition. The CRF staff developed the case, People v. Willow, involving charges of inducement and selling of drugs, and conducted orientations in 14 counties throughout the state. The orientations outlined the case, explained any changes in scoring, and discussed the guidelines for all involved. During the school year over 6,000 students participated in the Mock Trial local competition under the guidance and direction of 400 teachers, 1,000 attorney volunteers, and 350 Municipal, Superior, and Appellate Court Judges. Local competitions were funded through local sources.

The state finals, organized and facilitated by CRF staff, took place in April, 1989. A total of 341 students and teachers from 22 counties attended the three-day event, and 56 volunteer judges and attorneys served as coaches, scorers, and judges at the series of trials. Participant costs were funded through fees and grants. The event also included visitations to legislators and an awards banquet. California's first place winning team went on to take second place in the 1989 national finals in Kentucky. The Mock Trial case for

1988-89, People v. Willow, also became part of CRF's curriculum materials available to secondary teachers nationwide under a grant from the U.S. Department of Education.

Two Mock Trial evaluation meetings were held in May, 1989, where county coordinators met with CRF staff to discuss the 1988-89 event and make changes to the 1989-90 program. The results of the participant evaluation survey used for the Mock Trial finals were discussed. Twenty-nine percent of participant evaluations were returned. Ninety-three percent of the students rated the event overall as "valuable" (vs. "not valuable"). Teachers, attorneys, coaches, and parents also rated the event as "valuable." The legislative visitations were rated lower by students because many students were not able to attend. Sixty-six percent of students rated the visits as "valuable," 14 percent rated the visits as "not valuable," and 20 percent did not participate. Changes planned for the 1989-90 Mock Trials include increasing student participation through the addition of another round of trials and encouraging counties to have their local judges and attorneys serve at the state finals thus widening the participation of the professionals.

History Day Competitions. History Day was also a major activity administered and coordinated by the CRF during 1988-89. The program encourages students, grades 6-12, to research and prepare papers, projects, performances, and media presentations on a historical theme and to have them judged by history professionals. County or district offices of education organize local events, often in conjunction with a college or university, and then local finalists compete in statewide finals.

The 1988-89 sixth annual History Day in California involved over 20,000 students in over 30 counties. The CRF designed and produced the theme and informational flyers sent to every school district, school and public librarians, private and parochial schools, and past History Day teachers and students. County coordinators and CRF staff worked together in presenting orientations in nine areas statewide. These workshops focused on the process and content relating to the 1989 theme, "The Individual in History." Orientation sites were chosen from communities that had little or no involvement in the past. CRF staff developed and produced new and updated materials for the History Day curriculum binder for the orientations and communicated with coordinators from over 30 counties.

Local History Day competitions, funded locally, were attended by over 6,000 persons in addition to the over 20,000 students who participated. The programs involved over 700 professional staff who served as judges and 400 people who volunteered their services in putting on the local and county competitions. The state finals were held in May, 1989, in Sacramento. Planned, implemented, and facilitated by CRF staff, this event was attended by 661 student participants from 29 counties, 225 teachers, and 300 other adults; participation costs were paid through fees. One hundred thirty professionals from colleges and universities, elementary and secondary schools, historical societies and agencies, and businesses served as volunteer judges. The two-day event culminated with an awards breakfast for 1,150 people. Forty-nine first and second place winners attended National History Day in Maryland in June, 1989, and captured two first-, two second-, and one third-place awards.

Evaluation follow-up of History Day included evaluation survey forms completed by participants and an evaluation meeting of the History Day Advisory Committee, composed of CRF staff, County Coordinators, and a California Department of Education representative. Fifty-nine percent of participants at the History Day finals rated the overall experience as 5.0 (on a scale of 1.0 being "not valuable" to 5.0 being "very valuable"), and 38 percent rated the experience as between 3.0 and 4.0. Most student comments indicated that the History Day finals were an enjoyable educational experience. The History Day Advisory Committee reviewed the entire program for the year, covering location of the finals, scheduling, judging, special events, awards breakfast, and costs/fees. Suggestions for improvements included limiting the length of student questioning, ensuring that judging questions were more specific and thought-provoking, and possibly increasing the History Day fee from $20 to $25. Changes planned for 1989-90 included provision of a new format for judges' orientation and opening both divisions and all categories for first- and second-place to attend state finals. Counties will also be asked to provide judges for the finals because of increased student participation.

Law Day. Law Day, which is planned, organized, and facilitated by the CRF, provides two annual student statewide conferences on law and society presented by community and justice system volunteers. Participant costs are funded through the Los Angeles County Bar Association. Students have the option of choosing from a variety of panels, debates, and simulation activities organized thematically to present a substantive overview of specific legal issues. Other counties are encouraged to hold similar events and are provided with technical assistance by CRF staff.

The 19th annual Law Day conference was held in Los Angeles in April, 1989. The conference provided an opportunity for students to examine the legal system and the values upon which it is based. The event was attended by 543 teachers and students from 36 schools. Sixty-four lawyers, business professionals, and community members presented a series of workshops on the theme, "Access to Justice." While attendance was down from the previous year because of scheduling conflicts with the administration of the Scholastic Aptitude Test and prom nights, evaluations of those who did attend were positive. Eighty percent of the students and teachers who attended Law Day in Los Angeles rated the conference overall as "excellent," 15 percent said it was "good," 5 percent said it was "average," and no one said it was "poor." Evaluation comments were very positive concerning the content of the workshops. A representative comment of the student and teacher reactions described the workshop, "Students are Also Citizens," as "very interesting with lots of explanation on constitutional rights, the amendments, and student and adult rights."

A second Law Day conference was held at the Orange County Courthouse in May, 1989. Eight one-hour workshops, each offered twice, gave 327 students, teachers, and parents from 34 schools an opportunity to hear discussions and debates on issues relevant to law and society such as gang activity, juvenile crime, careers in law, and kids in crisis. Twenty-one presenters from law-related professions led the workshops.

Teacher Training. Another activity planned, implemented, and facilitated by CRF staff with Chapter 2 state-purposes funds is the provision of teacher

training. Training sessions include strategies appropriate for law-related education such as the use of resource volunteers in the classroom, participatory teaching strategies, and peer and cross-age teaching techniques. In addition, teachers are introduced to CRF infusion materials, i.e., instructional materials which provide sequential law-related lessons designed to be infused into world history, U.S. history, government, and economics classes. Participant costs and materials are funded through a competitive grant from the U.S. Department of Education. Teachers are released by their schools to attend training sessions and receive curriculum materials for use in their schools as part of the training. Particular effort is made to emphasize in the training sessions implementation strategies for the 1988 California Department of Education's History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools in the context of citizenship education.

During 1988-89, 120 teachers and administrators from six counties attended training workshops that focused on civic education from a historical and contemporary perspective. The sessions were held in four southern California locations. Each day-long session presented two speakers and a series of workshops that demonstrated a variety of teaching strategies. The teachers from grades 7-12 were given substitute pay and a stipend to purchase materials for their classrooms. In addition, civic education materials from CRF and other organizations were distributed at no cost to the participants. Evaluation survey forms were used for the sessions, and participants rated sessions as generally positive overall. Teachers were especially pleased with the interactive models, infusion materials, and professionalism of presenters.

Publications. The CRF also writes and coordinates the publishing of the Bill of Rights in Action, a quarterly publication funded through a grant from the U.S. Department of Education. Published and distributed nationwide, a total of 36,000 issues were distributed in California for 1988-89. Each issue disseminated in California contained inserts specially focused for California educators. The inserts, prepared by the CRF staff, addressed programs specific to California such as the Mock Trial and History Day. The series of issues for 1988-89 focused on First Amendment concerns: religion, assembly, speech, and press. Each issue presented CRF infusion materials for social studies, government, and world and U.S. history teachers in the area of citizenship, law, and justice.

Advisory Committees. The State Project Advisory Committee and History Day Advisory Committee are also coordinated and facilitated by the CRF staff. These committees are made up of professional representatives from education, government, justice, history, and community groups. The goals of the committees are to assist in the local implementation of CRF programs and to advise CRF in planning, developing, presenting, and evaluating CRF programs and activities.

The State Project Advisory Committee oversees the Mock Trial, Law Day, teacher training, and Bill of Rights in Action. Costs for attendance at committee meetings are born by committee members. During 1988-89, the inability of some members to pay for attendance at the annual State Project Advisory meeting caused a cancellation of the scheduled April, 1989, meeting. Plans were made to explore sources for reimbursement for committee members for 1989-90.

The History Day Advisory Committee oversees the CRF History Day program. Under the leadership of CRF staff, the History Day Advisory Committee met in May, 1989, to critique History Day and discuss changes for the 1989-90 program. The evaluation follow-up and plans for 1989-90 completed by this committee are discussed earlier in this report in the description of the History Day program.

Federal Teacher Centers

The California Federal Teacher Centers were established in 1978 under provisions of the federal Higher Education Act. The original federal grants were competitively awarded to the Teacher Centers and focused on assisting teachers to improve the effectiveness of their instructional program. In 1981 the Higher Education Act funding was one of the federal programs consolidated into the ECIA, Chapter 2, block grant. California has continued to fund each of the seven Federal Teacher Centers on a non-competitive basis with annual funding of $42,130 per center. During 1988-89, the seven Teacher Centers expended approximately $295,000 of Chapter 2 state-purposes funds. The goal of the centers is to meet the educational needs of students by providing educators with opportunities to learn content and instructional strategies, to develop and produce curriculum, and to apply research findings to improve instruction.

The seven California Federal Teacher Centers serve public and private schools in the counties of Marin, Santa Clara, San Francisco, Los Angeles, Alameda, San Mateo, and Orange. During 1988-89, conferences, workshops, and seminars were provided for educators, grades K through 12, covering (1) content-specific curriculum, (2) integrated instructional strategies, (3) management of instruction and environment, (4) integrated technology and curriculum, and (5) personal/professional growth. These programs reflect the focus of the current state framework implementation cycle as well as results of teacher needs assessments.

Table 2 summarizes all Teacher Centers' 1988-89 program data on conferences, workshops, and seminars. The table describes the subjects covered, the number of sessions provided, the number of participants and contact hours, and the evaluation rating by participants. The seven Teacher Centers provided 1,117 sessions for 37,639 participants during 1988-89. The overall rating of all sessions was 4.6 on a 5.0 scale, with 5.0 being the highest rating.

Table 2

PROGRAM INFORMATION

California Federal Teacher Centers
1988-89

Topics	Number of Sessions	Total Hours	Total Participants	Total Participant Hours	Average Evaluation[a]
(1) Curriculum					
a. Curriculum Development	2	28	14	176	4.50
b. English/Lang.Arts/Lit.	109	503	3,233	45,443	4.66
c. Reading	45	174	3,024	175,630	4.56
d. Writing	52	135	448	3,430	4.78
e. Mathematics	40	183	1,039	9,182	4.42
f. History/Social Science	40	134	321	2,651	4.80
g. Multi-cult./Int.Studies	7	14	128	736	4.60
h. Science	60	229	1,554	15,917	4.51
i. Health	28	88	1,297	11,441	4.43
j. Visual & Performing Arts	24	86	784	7,928	4.33
k. Physical Education	8	15	135	2,059	4.85
l. Industrial Arts	6	12	120	720	4.50
m. Inter-disciplinary Studies	8	28	1,648	12,944	4.95
n. Other Curriculum	5	17	405	2,133	4.35
SUB-TOTAL, Curriculum	434	1,646	14,150	290,390	4.59[c]
(2) Instructional Strategies	71	444	1,913	45,807	4.49
(3) Management	68	407	3,067	114,774	4.76
(4) Technology & Curr. Integration	380	2,871	2,318	280,302	4.55
(5) Personal/Prof.Growth	113	395	4,781	69,538	4.63
(6) Other	51	171	1,410	12,873	4.74
TOTAL	1,117	5,934	27,639[b]	813,684	4.60[c]

[a]Participants responded on a scale of 1.0 to 5.0, 1.0 being "poor" and 5.0 being "excellent."
[b]10,000 additional participants attended "drop-in" curriculum laboratories to design curriculum for their own classrooms.
[c]The average evaluation rating of all of the above ratings.

The services of the Teacher Centers are described as unique. The centers have long taken a leadership role in planning, developing, and providing in-depth seminars/workshops for public and private school educators emphasizing the directions set by the California Curriculum Frameworks, Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve; Model Curriculum Guides, Kindergarten Through Grade Eight; and Model Curriculum Standards, Grades Nine Through Twelve. In light of the 1988-89 state framework implementation cycle, which focused on the English-language arts content area, the centers provided 224,503 contact hours of English-language arts staff development. The Federal Teacher Centers also provided 114,774 hours of intensive in-service training in management of classroom instruction and environment for new teachers, experienced teachers, and paraprofessionals. Mentor Teachers received training in adult learning theories, presentation techniques, peer coaching methods appropriate to the use of technology, and integration of technology and curriculum. Through each center's board, the Teacher Centers have also taken a leadership role in establishing collaboration and networking among teachers and administrators in both public and private schools, higher education, and county and state education agencies.

Evaluation of the Teacher Centers has been ongoing since the centers were established. The centers' success is reflected in the number of participants and contact hours and the participants' high evaluation ratings. Another indicator of effectiveness has been the ongoing financial support received by Teacher Centers from their respective districts, both in direct and indirect means. Direct support is indicated through a line item in a district's budget. Indirect support is represented by fee payments for materials and attendance at activities.

Although it is commonly recognized that it is difficult to establish a one-to-one relationship between student improvement and the skills applied from staff development, some findings have suggested student improvements as a result of application of staff development training. A survey conducted by the San Mateo County Teacher Center during 1987-88 asked teachers who had participated for several years in the center-sponsored writing program, i.e., the Bay Area Writing Project, to rate the effectiveness of what they had learned in relation to application in the classroom. Eighty percent of the 30 respondents stated that their effectiveness as a teacher had been enhanced by the Teacher Center's staff development and that their students had gained knowledge and skills as a result of the application of this program. Sixty-seven percent agreed that their students were more motivated, interested, or actively engaged in the writing process because of the skills and techniques they had learned.

While most evaluations of the Federal Teacher Centers have been through participant ratings, two studies have been planned which will assess student achievement related to staff development. The Marin County Teacher Center has received $90,000 from the Marin Community Foundation to provide teacher in-service training in thematic teaching and to conduct an evaluation of student outcomes related to in-service training. The evaluation will be a case study approach which includes pre- and post-observation of classrooms in the study. A final report of the evaluation is scheduled to be completed by May, 1990.

A second grant to evaluate student improvement linked to staff development is one received by the Orange County Teacher Center through the Environmental

Education Unit of the Department of Education. The project will provide training to teachers, grades 6-8, in higher-level-thinking skills and the integration of the content areas of English-language arts, history-social science, and science. The evaluation component will include pre- and post-assessment of student progress. A final report was to be available by June, 1990.

As a result of collaborative planning, teacher program requests, and evaluation studies, several needs have been identified as goals for the Teacher Centers: additional, specific content training in the implementation of the English-language arts, history-social science, and visual and performing arts framework; training in integrated content and instructional approaches to meet the diversity of the student population; and continued evaluation studies to determine the relationship between staff development activities and student achievement.

History Project of California

The History Project of California, formerly titled Constitutional Teachers Institute, expended $100,000 during 1988-89 to further local implementation of the 1988 History-Social Science Framework for California Schools.

The objectives of the History Project of California were met by July, 1989, but through a different topic and process than originally proposed. The change occurred because evaluations from the framework conferences during the spring and fall of 1988 showed that the greatest needs of local educators in implementation of the new History-Social Science Framework were not primarily staff development but textbooks and appropriate instructional materials. The framework calls for the use of many resources to teach the curriculum including materials beyond the traditional textbook, such as primary sources, literature of varied genre, music, visual art, dance, and drama.

A special ad hoc task group consisting of representatives from the Framework Committee, the Curriculum Commission, higher education, and the Department of Education met in November, 1989, and refocused directions for the History Project of California. It was decided that the development of course models rather than extensive staff development in history content or instructional strategies should become the primary objective of the Constitutional Teachers Institute during 1988-89.

Approximately $40,000 of the $100,000 in Chapter 2 funding was used during December, 1988, through May, 1989, for the identification of available materials. This process was accomplished by seven researchers comprised of curriculum specialists and higher education faculty. The identified materials were organized by units in a series of binders for each grade level. Most materials were copies of resources available from archives or libraries. Some materials considered exemplary in nature were purchased.

The remaining $60,000 of the $100,000 was used in conjunction with 1989-90 Chapter 2 funding to conduct the History Project of California at the University of California, Los Angeles, in July, 1989. The goals of the institute were to develop course models and resource listings for the History-Social Science Framework and to train a cadre of teachers to become leaders in their schools

and districts in the framework content and resources. All of the resource materials organized during 1988-89 were utilized by the 68 institute participants whose task it was to develop course models for the framework.

Participants were chosen from those nominated by the County State Steering Committee and professional organizations who provide staff development. The purpose of the selection by this process was to obtain knowledgeable teachers who had the potential as future teacher trainers and to obtain proportionate ethnic representation. The response for ethnic representation was lower than expected; some nominees were consequently dropped, and the Department conducted a special recruitment. From a pool of 129 candidates, 68 teachers, representing various geographical locations and ethnic backgrounds, were selected to participate. Candidates were selected according to their understanding of and commitment to implementation of the History-Social Science Framework, their content expertise, their understanding of curriculum reform, and their ability to teach and train other teachers in a variety of content-appropriate methodologies.

During the 15-day institute each day was devoted to two to three hours of lectures and four to five hours of discussions, demonstrations, course model development, presentations, and grade level meetings with scholars and facilitators. The course models which participants developed were designed for selected grades (K-8 and 11) and were aligned with the course descriptions and units in the framework. The models include recommendations relating to the amount of time for teaching each unit and topics within each unit, some resources to teach each topic (primary sources, literature, and other varied resources), and content-appropriate instructional strategies which would engage all students in the learning process. It is planned that the course models will be field-tested during the 1989-90 year, refined based on field-testing, and published in 1990. It is anticipated that dissemination to local agencies will take place during six regional institutes for 100 teachers each. The 1988-89 institute participants will be teacher trainers at these 1989-90 institutes. In an effort to complete course model development, an institute on a smaller scale for the other grades not previously covered (9, 10, and 12) is planned.

In addition to creation of the course models, the History Project of California also provided material for the development of grade level videotapes to describe and/or exemplify implementation of the curriculum as described in the framework. The Orange County Office of Education videotaped key sessions which included question and answer discussions by grade level concerning framework implementation; highlights from some of the general session speakers; and segments of the course model presentations by grade level groups. The video product will be augmented with examples of the curriculum being implemented in the classroom. Funded from non-Chapter 2 sources, production and dissemination of the grade level videos will occur during 1989-90.

An evaluation survey was conducted for the institute with a response rate of approximately 96 percent. Based upon data gathered in the survey and through informal comments, an evaluation report was completed. Overall, participants rated the institute as 8.5 on a scale of 1 to 10, 10 being the highest. The participants expressed a wide range of comments for the strengths of the institute as well as recommendations for the improvement of future institutes.

One comment which typified many participant responses was the following: "I came here not knowing much about primary sources. I feel comfortable that the information I gathered at this institute will be very valuable to me and my peers in the district." In addition, the evaluation report suggests using the teacher participants as advisors to the follow-up institutes planned for 1989-90.

Superintendents Academy

The Superintendents Academy project was allocated $50,000 in Chapter 2 funds for 1988-89 to provide seminars to superintendents throughout the state on key elements of district effectiveness. Because of unanticipated problems in hiring a local coordinator for the program, the restrictive schedules of key superintendents selected for the advisory planning committee, and the absence of a California School Leadership Academy (CSLA) director for most of the 1988-89 year, much of the planning and development of the Superintendents Academy was delayed during 1988-89. The $50,000 in Chapter 2 funding for 1988-89 was carried over into 1989-90 in order to complete the project.

In July, 1989, an advisory committee convened in San Francisco in order to plan the content and scheduling of seminars for the Superintendents Academy. The advisory committee consisted of 21 key educational leaders, which included the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; local superintendents and assistant superintendents representing 16 districts; Department of Education staff; and CSLA staff. The committee agreed that the Superintendents Academy would focus on short, concise seminars rather than multiple days of training sessions. Additionally, the advisory committee discussed district effectiveness elements that would comprise the seminars and suggested that topics be developed for a fall, 1989, pilot seminar for approximately 40 superintendents. Six major issue areas will be covered in the pilot seminar: resource allocation, definition of curricular quality, accountability, staff development, organizational culture, and strategic planning. Following the pilot seminar, content will be refined and further seminars will be scheduled throughout the state during the spring of 1990.

IV. HIGHLIGHTS

This report describes major accomplishments and activities funded by Chapter 2 state-purposes funds during 1988-89 for six projects: Parent Involvement, High Risk Youth, Constitutional Rights Foundation, Federal Teacher Centers, History Project of California, and Superintendents Academy. With regard to these Chapter 2-funded projects, the following overall strengths and recommendations for improvement were identified.

Among the strengths of 1988-89 state-purposes funded products or services were the following:

1. Chapter 2 state-purposes funds have been used to provide local educators with high-quality products such as the course models for implementation of the History-Social Science Framework for California Public Schools: Kindergarten Through Grade Twelve and The Changing Mathematics Curriculum: A Booklet for Parents. These documents reflect a cost savings to the state as the development and dissemination of products such as these would be beyond the capability of most local districts to produce. In addition, Chapter 2 state-purposes funds have provided extensive training for local educators in a wide variety of topics ranging from in-depth curriculum to effective schools management. Overall, these trainings have been judged by participants as useful.

2. Through the use of Chapter 2 funds, California has taken a lead in establishing a statewide parent involvement initiative. As a part of this effort, the Department of Education held regional workshops designed to support local educators in developing effective parent involvement in schools.

3. The Constitutional Rights Foundation, a nationwide organization serving California directly through its Chapter 2 funding, has developed, organized, and administered quality, hands-on student and teacher activities which cover highly challenging content, student leadership, and involvement and interaction in the classroom, school, and community.

4. Chapter 2 funding of projects such as the Constitutional Rights Foundation and the Federal Teacher Centers has stimulated local agencies to provide in-kind funding and volunteer services for these programs. The high participant ratings and continuous local in-kind support for the programs are indicators of their usefulness.

Recommendations for improvement of 1988-89 state-purposes funded products or services were identified as follows:

1. C-LERN is becoming a widely utilized process for school improvement in California. Because of the magnitude of the implementation and the need for effective models for school improvement, it is important that a comprehensive

evaluation of the effectiveness of the process be conducted. Because a comprehensive, external evaluation would require a substantial commitment of resources, funding for the evaluation should be provided independent of program funding.

2. The 1989-90 Chapter 2 evaluation report should include a reporting of the activities of the Superintendents Academy conducted in 1989-90 with carryover funds from 1988-89.

V. COMMENTS OF THE GOVERNOR'S ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON CHAPTER 2

The Evaluation Report has been reviewed by members of the Governor's Advisory Committee on Chapter 2. The report was well received by the Committee members, who felt that it was comprehensive. The committee members want to follow up on the recommendations in this report to determine the extent to which they are implemented. The committee recommended that three areas be included in the 1990-1991 evaluation:

- Promoting the teaching of uncommonly taught languages
- Non-public schools program
- Improving the preparation of underrepresented minorities

APPENDIX A

Expenditure Detail of
Selected Chapter 2 State-Purposes Activities
1988-89

Parent Involvement
(SDE Operations)

Expenditure Category	Chapter 2
SDE staff salaries & benefits	$80,684
Editing, printing, media, & distribution of materials for seminars	15,281
Postage	3,785
SDE staff travel for Steering Committee meetings & Parent Involvement seminars	7,868
Contract consultants to develop Parent Involvement Initiative & conduct seminars	8,744
Equipment & office supplies	4,174
Indirect costs*	45,033
TOTAL:	$165,569

SDE staff	FTE
Professional education staff Consultants	1.0
Clerical staff	1.0
TOTAL SDE STAFF:	2.0

Chapter 2 funds paid for:

1) State staff to facilitate and coordinate Steering Committee development of the Department of Education Parent Initiative;

2) Production and dissemination of the Parent Involvement Initiative;

3) Consultant services to assist state staff in developing and conducting seminars for the Parent Involvement Initiative;

4) Facilities and displays for the Parent Involvement Initiative seminars; and

5) State staff to facilitate and coordinate the development of the Intradepartmental Committee on Parent Involvement.

*Includes telephone, office space, SDE services such as accounting and grants processing, and other state agency services such as the Controller and the Department of Finance services.

High Risk Youth
(SDE Operations)

Expenditure Category	Chapter 2
SDE staff salaries & benefits	$150,761
Editing, printing, & media for conference/workshop materials	13,764
Postage	1,262
SDE staff travel for conferences/workshops	7,827
Contract consultants to present & conduct conferences/workshops	38,076
Facilities fees (including food & lodging) for conferences/workshops	59,313
Contract consultant fees for developing conferences/workshops	28,500
Equipment & supplies	5,355
Indirect costs*	72,013
TOTAL:	$376,871

SDE staff	FTE
Professional education staff	
Consultants	3.0
Clerical staff	1.0
TOTAL SDE STAFF:	4.0

Chapter 2 funds paid for:

1) State staff to develop, facilitate, and coordinate three summer institutes, four regional workshops, planning for the 1989-90 Curriculum Academy, and evaluation of C-LERN schools;

2) Consultant services to assist state staff in developing, presenting, and conducting conferences and workshops to assist C-LERN schools in implementation strategies;

3) Facilities, participant food and lodging, materials, and displays for the conferences and workshops; and

4) State staff and contract consultants to develop the agenda, content, and logistics for the 1989-90 Curriculum Academy to assist C-LERN schools in implementation of curriculum plans.

*Includes telephone, office space, SDE services such as accounting and grants processing, and other state agency services such as the Controller and the Department of Finance services.

Constitutional Rights Foundation
(Legislative Priority Project)

Expenditure Category	Chapter 2
CRF staff salaries & benefits	$159,809
Editing & printing of manuals/handouts	20,484
Postage	5,069
CRF staff travel for Mock Trial & History Day orientations & state finals	11,615
Facility fees for orientations & state finals	19,805
Supplies	3,965
Equipment	3,000
Indirect costs*	76,253
TOTAL:	$300,000

CRF staff	FTE
Project Directors	2.6
Clerical staff	2.0
TOTAL CRF STAFF:	4.6

Chapter 2 funds paid for:

1) CRF staff to develop, facilitate, and/or coordinate Mock Trial competitions, History Day competitions, Law Day competitions, secondary teacher training in History/Social Science, the quarterly production of the Bill of Rights in Action, and the State Project and History Day Advisory Committees;

2) Production and dissemination of Mock Trial, History Day, and teacher training curriculum materials; and

3) Facilities fees for Mock Trial and History Day orientations and state finals and Advisory Committee meeting.

*Includes items such as telephone, office space, insurance, legal, and accounting services.

Federal Teacher Centers
(Legislative Priority Project)

Expenditure Category	Chapter 2
Teacher Center staff salaries and benefits	$175,112
Printing, purchasing, and dissemination of workshop materials	16,114
Staff/consultant travel for conferences/workshops	7,267
Contract consultants/participant fees for workshops	77,519
Supplies	2,474
Equipment	5,110
Indirect costs*	11,314
TOTAL:	$294,910

Chapter 2 funds paid for:

1) Teacher Centers staff to develop, facilitate, coordinate, and sponsor staff development conferences, workshops, and seminars;

2) Production and dissemination of materials for conferences, workshops, and seminars; and

3) Contract consultants to provide presentations for conferences, workshops, and seminars.

*Includes items such as telephone, office space, insurance, legal, and accounting services.

History Project of California
(Superintendent's Priority Project)

Expenditure Category	Chapter 2
History Project of California coordinator and assistant	$13,000
Contract consultants to plan and conduct institute	15,000
Researcher stipends, expenses, and materials fees for identification of institute materials	12,216
Purchasing and copying of materials	13,239
Postage	545
Facilities fees for institute	36,000
Indirect costs*	10,000
TOTAL:	$100,000

Chapter 2 funds paid for:

1) Project staff to plan, develop, coordinate, and conduct the Constitutional Teachers Institute;

2) Stipends and travel for an advisory committee of scholars and teachers to do short-term and long-range planning for the institute, implementation of the History/Social Science Framework, and staff development for teachers;

3) Contract consultant to serve as resident scholar, primary consultant, and lead course model writer for the institute;

4) Researcher staff to identify available resource materials for the institute;

5) Printing and purchasing of materials for the institute; and

6) Facilities fees for the institute.

*Includes items such as telephone, office space, insurance, legal, and accounting services.

APPENDIX B

Information Regarding Local ECIA, Chapter 2, Expenditures and Activities

Table B1

DISTRICT EXPENDITURES OF ECIA. CHAPTER 2, FUNDS
1986-87 THROUGH 1988-89
(in millions of dollars)

Resources Supported	1986-87		1987-88		1988-89	
	Amount	Percent of Total	Amount	Percent of Total	Amount	Percent of Total
Books and other printed material	$12.8	34.4%	$11.5	34.0%	$15.3	41.4%
Certificated staff	8.9	24.0	7.5	22.2	7.3	19.7
Computer equipment	4.3	11.7	4.0	11.8	4.2	11.3
Audiovisual laboratory	3.0	8.2	2.7	8.0	2.9	7.7
Other noncertificated staff	1.7	4.4	2.7	8.0	2.1	5.7
Instructional aides/ technicians	1.5	4.0	0.9	2.7	1.1	3.0
Other	4.9	13.3	4.5	13.3	4.2	11.2
TOTAL	$37.1	100.0	$33.8	100.0	$37.1	100.0

Table B2

PERCENT OF FUNDS EXPENDED FOR VARIOUS ACTIVITIES
SUPPORTED BY ECIA, CHAPTER 2, 1986-87 through 1988-89

Activity	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89*
Classroom instruction	33.8%	30.3%	29.1%
Media or library services	44.3	49.0	43.9
Staff development	6.3	5.7	7.5
Curriculum development	6.1	6.0	6.0
Student support services (e.g. counseling, guidance, health services)	3.0	2.6	2.8
Administrative support services	3.0	2.5	2.7
Parent or community services	0.5	0.1	0.9
Other	3.0	3.8	3.9
TOTAL	100.0	100.0	96.8

*The percents for 1988-89 are based on data from public schools only. In previous years, the data were based on an average of public schools and private schools. The figures do not add up to 100 percent because of reporting errors by LEAs.

Table B3

PRIORITIES OF DISTRICTS REGARDING THE USE OF ECIA, CHAPTER 2, FUNDS 1986-87 THROUGH 1988-89

Program Emphasis	Rank Order			
	Prior to Implementation of ECIA, Chapter 2	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
General student population	1	1	1	1
Low-achieving students	2	2	2	2
Limited-English-proficient students	3	4	4	3
Handicapped students	4	6	6	6
High-achieving students	5.5	3	3	4
Migrant students	5.5	7	7	7
Students in high technology classes	7	5	5	5

Table B4

FUNDING PRIORITIES IN ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS FOR ECIA, CHAPTER 2, FUNDS, 1986-87 THROUGH 1988-89

Program Emphasis	Rank Order					
	Elementary Schools			Secondary Schools		
	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89	1986-87	1987-88	1988-89
General student population	1	1	1	1	1	1
Low-achieving students	2	2	2	2	2	2
Limited-English-proficient students	4	4	3	4	4	3
Handicapped students	6	6	6	6	6	6
High-achieving students	3	3	4	3	3	4
Migrant students	7	7	7	7	7	7
Students in high technology classes	5	5	5	5	5	5

90-18 DE14478 8-90 55